

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Examiner Objections - Claims

Claim 1 was objected to because of informalities. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims. However, the Applicant respectfully traverses the claim amendments suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner objects to the claims and suggests claim amendments without giving any reason for the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by 3GPP-TS-33-200 (3GPP TS 33.200 V5.0.0 Release 5 March 2002) (hereinafter TS 33.200). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

TS 33.200 discloses two networks (PLMN A, PLMN B) mentioned in Fig. 1. Security Associations (SA) need to be established between the respective MAP network elements. All interconnected operators must use at least MAPsec with suitable protection levels. (TS 33.200, Section 4, paragraph 2)

This standard is silent about a gateway node configured to send and receive mobile application part messages from a first domain and a second domain. The MAP network elements disclosed in TS 33.200 are directly connected to each other. Therefore they have to use the same protocols and parameters such that the MAPsec message are understandable for each of them.

FIG. 1 of the present Application clearly shows a "first gateway node" (e.g., MSEG1) in PLMN-A and PLMN-B. This gateway node is also present in the claims. TS 33.200 only discloses that its PLMN's include KAC's and MAP NE's. TS 33.200 does not disclose or contemplate the use of a gateway node. There is no gateway node between the MAPsec nodes of the different domains in TS 33.200. In addition, an advantage provided by the present claims is to implement further MAPsec instances in a flexible manner. This advantage is not contemplated by TS 33.200.

In view of the above arguments, Applicant asserts that independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over TS 33.200. Dependent claims 2-5 and 7-10 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas Bethea, Jr./

Thomas Bethea, Jr
Registration No. 53,987

Date: July 12, 2010

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4859
thomas.bethea.jr@ericsson.com